

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
at CHATTANOOGA

ROBERT SHERMAN NIX III, *et al.*,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,

*Defendants.*

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

Case No. 1:17-cv-235

Judge Mattice

Magistrate Judge Steger

**ORDER**

On February 22, 2018, United States Magistrate Judge Christopher H. Steger filed a Report and Recommendation [Doc. 3] pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). Magistrate Judge Steger recommended that this action be dismissed as frivolous. [*Id.*]. Plaintiffs have not filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, the Court has reviewed *de novo* the record in this matter, and it agrees with the Magistrate Judge's well-reasoned conclusions. Accordingly, the Court **ACCEPTS** and **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Steger's findings of fact and conclusions of law. Plaintiffs' claim is hereby **DISMISSED**. A separate judgment will enter.

**SO ORDERED** this 27th day of August, 2014.

\_\_\_\_\_  
*/s/ Harry S. Mattice, Jr.*  
HARRY S. MATTICE, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Magistrate Judge Steger specifically advised Plaintiffs they had 14 days in which to object to the Report and Recommendation and that failure to do so would waive his right to appeal. [Doc. 3]; *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); *see also* *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 148-51 (1985) (noting that "[i]t does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate's factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings").